



Nixon Peabody LLP  
Tower 46  
55 West 46th Street  
New York, NY 10036-4120  
Attorneys at Law  
nixonpeabody.com  
@NixonPeabodyLLP

**Stephen P. Younger**  
Senior Counsel  
T / 212.940.3036  
F / 833.709.7111  
spyounger@nixonpeabody.com

October 30, 2023

***VIA ECF***

Hon. Katherine Polk Failla  
United States District Judge  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York  
40 Foley Square, Room 2103  
New York, NY 10007

**MEMO ENDORSED**

RE: Huzhou Chuangtai Rongyuan Investment Management Partnership et al v. Qin;  
No. 1:21-cv-09221-KPF  
Request of Third-Party Duo “Emma” Liu to Seal Documents

Dear Judge Failla:

Pursuant to Section 9(c)(ii) of Your Honor’s Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases and the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order dated January 3, 2023, Dkt. No. 92 (the “Confidentiality Order”), which also covers discovery of third-parties, third-party “Emma” Duo Liu (“Ms. Liu”) writes to respectfully request that the Court permit the sealing of her Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of her Motion for Reargument or Reconsideration (filed contemporaneously herewith) and the Reply Declaration of Stephen P. Younger, Esq. (“Younger Reply Decl.”) with exhibits (filed contemporaneously herewith) filed in support thereof.

A party seeking to file a document under seal needs to address the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents. *See, e.g., Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119-20 (2d Cir. 2006). And any redaction or sealing of a court filing needs to be narrowly tailored to serve whatever purpose justifies the redaction or sealing and must be otherwise consistent with the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents. *Id.*

The Court must balance this common law presumption of access against competing interests, including “the privacy interests of those resisting disclosure.” *Lugosch*, 435 F.3d at 120 (quoting *United States v. Amodeo*, 71 F.3d 1044, 1050 (2d Cir. 1995)). Thus, the issue is whether “the privacy interests of the [moving party] outweigh the presumption of public access.” *GoSMiLE*, 769 F. Supp. 2d at 649-50.

Given the nature of this matter (a private matter to collect a judgment from Respondent Qin) and the fact that Ms. Liu is not a judgment-debtor in this action, but merely a third-party whose private affairs are being dragged into this dispute and given the ongoing criminal investigation about which the Court has been informed, we submit that there is a more than sufficient basis to seal Ms. Liu’s Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of her Motion for

Hon. Katherine Polk Failla  
October 30, 2023  
Page 2

Attorneys at Law  
nixonpeabody.com  
@NixonPeabodyLLP

Argument or Reconsideration and the Reply Declaration of Stephen P. Younger, Esq. ("Younger Reply Decl.") in support thereof. These documents contain confidential information of the kind that is deserving of protection and restricting public access, and therefore third-party Ms. Liu respectfully requests that the Court grant this request. We note that for presumably similar reasons, various other docket entries in this case have been sealed.

In the event that the Court were to deny this request, Ms. Liu requests a Court conference at the Court's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. Younger

To: All parties of record via ECF

Application GRANTED. The Clerk of Court is directed to maintain docket entries 320 and 321 under seal.

The Clerk of Court is further directed to terminate the pending motion at docket entry 318.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 2, 2023  
New York, New York



HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE